UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

NATIONAL RIFLE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff, *

-v- 18-cv-566 *

ANDREW CUOMO, MARIA T. VULLO, et al.,

Defendants. *

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
BEFORE THE HONORABLE CHRISTIAN F. HUMMEL
December 4, 2019
445 Broadway, Albany, New York

FOR THE GOVERNMENT:

BREWER, ATTORNEYS & COUNSELORS By: John C. Canoni, Esq. 1717 Main Street, Suite 5900 Dallas, Texas 75201

FOR THE DEFENDANT ANDREW CUOMO:

OFFICE OF THE NEW YORK STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL By: William A. Scott, AAG
The Capitol
Albany, New York 12224

FOR THE DEFENDANT MARIA T. VULLO:

EMERY CELLI BRINCKERHOFF & ABADY, LLP. By: Debra L. Greenberger, Esq. 600 Fifth Avenue, 10th Floor New York, New York 10020

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

-NATIONAL RIFLE v CUOMO - 18-cv-566-

COURT CLERK: The case is National Rifle Association versus Cuomo, docket number 18-cv-566. Appearances for the record, please. MR. CANONI: Good afternoon, your Honor. name is John Canoni for the firm Brewer, Attorneys & Counselors. With me today, but not appearing for the record because she's not yet admitted to this court, is Brittany Siscoe from our office. THE COURT: Good afternoon, Counsel. Good afternoon, Ms. Siscoe. MR. SCOTT: William Scott, New York State Office of the Attorney General, for Defendants DFS and Cuomo. MS. GREENBERGER: Debra Greenberger from Emery, Celli, Brinckerhoff & Abady for the Defendant Maria Vullo. Good afternoon, your Honor. THE COURT: Good afternoon, Ms. Greenberger. Good afternoon, Mr. Scott. I scheduled this conference because I received a series of letters from counsel regarding proposal by the plaintiff, National Rifle Association of America, seeking leave of the Court to serve an amended complaint in this matter.

Docket No. 145 is a letter from the Brewer firm, signed by Mr. Canoni, dated November 25th of 2019

-NATIONAL RIFLE v CUOMO - 18-cv-566-

laying out, at the Court's direction, what has transpired since Judge McAvoy's decision on the motion to dismiss, which was entered on May 9th of 2019.

Docket No. 146 is a letter from Mr. Scott on behalf of Governor Cuomo setting forth his opposition to the request from the NRA that they be granted leave to serve an amended complaint in this matter, and Docket No. 147 is a letter from Mr. Celli and Mr. Greenberger, on behalf of their client, Maria Vullo, indicating their position with request to Mr. Canoni's earlier letter seeking leave to serve an amended complaint in this matter.

I'd just note the following: That the initial deadline to file any application to amend pleadings as set forth in Docket No. 66, which was the Uniform Pretrial Scheduling Order, January 31st of 2019.

Mr. Canoni, in his letter of November 25th, 2019, correctly points out that it would have been difficult to make this motion directed to repleading their selective enforcement claim as Judge McAvoy's decision was not issued until May 9th of 2019.

So the extent that that period of time is a consideration, the Court agrees with plaintiff's counsel that, as a practical matter, it's difficult to make a motion to amend until you receive Judge McAvoy's

decision on May 9th of 2019.

I guess, Mr. Canoni, let me ask you a question. What has transpired between May 9th of 2019 and the date that you sent your letter to the Court seeking leave to amend your pleadings that brings us here today?

MR. CANONI: Thank you, your Honor.

And I would just note, I'd like a little latitude to expand a little bit. We didn't have a lot of time to put the letter together or I'm happy to answer any questions Your Honor might have.

I also just want to make clear, and I don't want to get caught up on semantics, we are not seeking leave to serve our amended complaint. We haven't filed our motions to amend yet.

THE COURT: Seeking leave to make a motion.

MR. CANONI: Yes, I wanted that -- I wanted everybody to be clear about that, and I knew Your Honor knew, and I'll be very clear today on what we want to do when we file our motion to amend.

We are not -- Mr. Scott will be happy, at least temporarily. We are not, as part of this amendment, seeking to replead this selective enforcement claim as to Governor Cuomo. We are only seeking to replead the selective enforcement claim as to Ms. Vullo.

-NATIONAL RIFLE v CUOMO - 18-cv-566-

The basis for that, your Honor, is that we now have a basis to plausibly allege specific facts that Ms. Vullo was aware of the comparators in February and March of 2018, which is critical because it is prior to the April 2018 guidance letters, prior to the consent orders that are at issue in this case and, therefore, we believe addresses the deficiencies that were addressed in Judge McAvoy's May 9th decision.

Now, there's been some talk in the letters regarding documents that the NRA obtained from Lloyd's in the summer of 2019. However, I do agree with Ms. Greenberger's letter in one respect, which is the documents from Lloyd's, on their face, don't tell the whole story. You needed to get interpretative evidence from those letters as to conversations that Ms. Vullo had with Lloyd's and others about the comparators and her knowledge thereof.

We tried to get that information from Lloyd's, we were not able to do so, and it's only in the last month or so, through our own investigative efforts from non-parties, that we were able to obtain the information that will be in our proposed second amended complaint as it specifically relates to Ms. Vullo.

THE COURT: Who did you get that information from, Mr. Canoni, and when?

-NATIONAL RIFLE v CUOMO - 18-cv-566-

MR. CANONI: We got it from a consulting individual. I'd rather not disclose their name now but it's somebody that was knowledgeable of the conversations between DFS, Ms. Vullo and Lloyd's.

THE COURT: Okay. Go ahead, Mr. Canoni.

MR. CANONI: And so, your Honor, that's -- I think should be the open-and-shut part of the delay issue.

There's case law replete. We cited a little bit of it in our letter brief. You know, delay of a month or two is certainly not grounds for delay. I will confess to the Court that we were trying to follow up through this source and others to see if there was any evidence that linked Governor Cuomo to the same conversations, and we recognize that we didn't want to sit on this evidence. When we were not able to do that, we made the decision to ask the Court for leave to amend.

I want everybody to be clear that, if in discovery in this case we obtain evidence that indicates Governor Cuomo similarly had knowledge, we will be coming back to the Court when we obtain that information and seek to replead again.

I'll address a couple other issues and then
I'll be happy to answer your questions. There's been

some discussion about the fact that we did not submit the proposed amended pleading. I'm sure Your Honor is familiar with the local rule. We do that when we file our motion. We are happy to do that.

There was some evidence -- indication that the NRA was not clear that it sought to replead.

Mr. Scott's letter made reference to a couple of docket entries, ECF 117 and ECF 130. I would note in ECF 117, which was dated July 30th at pages 6, 7, that the NRA said we are talking about, quote, claims that were dismissed by the Court that the NRA seeks to replead in the future.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. CANONI: And in Docket 130-1, dated August 23rd at page 6, it discusses the equal protection claims dismissed by the Court without prejudice and expressly states, quote, the NRA intends to replead such claims. Also in ECF 119, which was the letter to Your Honor regarding the motion for evidence to be conducted under the Hague Convention, the letter expressly states that the information sought, quote, is also necessary to support the NRA's selective enforcement claim that the NRA intends to replead.

Just moving along and then I'll be finished shortly.

-NATIONAL RIFLE v CUOMO - 18-cv-566-

Once you get past the diligence part, the

Court needs to look at the prejudice with respect to the

defendants and, in fact, we cite one case, there are

many that we're happy to bring to the Court's attention

in our pleading, if the Court desires. Even if the

Court found for some reason that we had this information

months ago, sat on it, and didn't act until now, you

could still grant leave to amend or leave to file the

motion to amend if there was no prejudice.

THE COURT: I guess, Mr. Canoni, one of my concerns is this case appears to me to be going nowhere.

I mean, there are at present -- I lost track -- at least four motions which are pending.

When the Court decided the motion with respect to Ms. Vullo, there's now a motion to re-argue pending. When the Court decided the motion with respect to your motion to compel, you filed an appeal to Judge McAvoy, and now I have a special court-appointed master or referee looking at north of 15,000 documents.

My concern is we're making no progress moving this matter forward and my concern is, if you file yet another motion to amend, that will delay the matter even further.

What suggestion do you have to move this matter forward towards a resolution?

-NATIONAL RIFLE v CUOMO - 18-cv-566-

MR. CANONI: Your Honor, as the plaintiff, I would be remiss if I didn't say we would like to start conducting discovery. I understand there are these motions pending and I'm not accusing anybody of acting not diligently in doing that.

I will say for this claim specifically, Your Honor noted the appeal we had. We said quite clearly that the evidence that we're looking for that is critical to the extent First Amendment retaliation claims is the same evidence that could support the selective enforcement claim.

So there will be no retreading of discovery. You know, I would say as well, these claims have been known to the defendants for quite some time.

I wish I had a better way to go about this.

This is exasperating for me, coming into this case midstream, seeing the lack of significant progress, and I share Your Honor's frustration. We really just want to get the documents and start going.

THE COURT: My concern is the case is -- I'm not blaming you or anybody in particular but as a practical matter, the case is 19 months old and, you know, if you read the Civil Case Management Plan, it says cases should be trial ready in 18 months.

In any event, this case should be tried in --

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

-NATIONAL RIFLE v CUOMO - 18-cv-566-

in three years at the outside. At present, it's simply not going to happen because I don't know when Judge McAvoy's going to decide your appeal. I don't know when the special master is going to be done going through the 15,000-plus documents, and once Mr. Hill completes that, I then need to do a report and recommendation for some sort of order which would reflect with respect to what he does, and then I assume one or both of you or all three of you will appeal to Judge McAvoy, which will delay the matter further. MR. CANONI: I understood. I do have a suggestion with respect to the special master. apologize --THE COURT: What would that be? MR. CANONI: -- stepping in. In other cases where a special master has been looking at volumes of documents in the tens of thousands, the counsel for the parties have had successive meetings with a special master to argue discreet items before the special master that would eliminate, perhaps, some of these subsequent appeals. THE COURT: I'm happy --I'm happy to write a letter to MR. CANONI: the special master copying Your Honor laying that out. I guess, you know, when the time THE COURT:

comes for Mr. Scott and Ms. Greenberger to speak, I'll ask them their view of that, but I want to talk to the special master first and have some sense of where he is and how he wishes to proceed.

What else do you want to tell me, Mr. Canoni, if anything?

MR. CANONI: Just running through the rest of our piece here, with respect to the prejudice, which is where we left off, I would submit that the defendants cannot demonstrate any prejudice and certainly not undue prejudice, which is the standard.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. CANONI: Under the law in this Circuit, they have the burden to demonstrate the prejudice and merely claiming prejudice is not enough.

Ms. Vullo, with respect to these repled claims, will not have to expend significant additional resources because it's the same discovery that we're going to be seeking with respect to the First Amendment retaliation claims against her.

Lastly, I would just note that in this
Circuit, there's a strong policy of having disputes
decided on the merit. I'm sure Your Honor knows that.
I'm also prepared, given Your Honor's exhortations
during the last conference call, that we try to work

more together.

I have a proposed briefing schedule that does not try to hamstring Ms. Vullo's counsel during the holidays, give her four weeks to respond and I will point out to Your Honor that we do need to file a motion to file exhibits under seal.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. CANONI: Unfortunately, another exasperating point here is all of the documents are marked confidential and, therefore, if we want to attach exhibits to the proposed second amended complaint, those exhibits will need to be filed under seal but we can do that at the same time we file the motion to amend.

I'm happy to do this later but I would just suggest sometime next week, maybe Friday the 13th, just because that seems like a perfect day for this case, our deadline to submit our papers, it would give Ms. Vullo's counsel four weeks until January 10th, obviously these can be extended, but just to demonstrate good faith that we're not trying to push people to work over the holidays, and then ten days later, unfortunately, is a federal holiday, Martin Luther King, so the 21st of January would be our proposed reply date.

Unless Your Honor has any other questions --THE COURT: I don't at this time, Mr. Canoni.

Thank you.

Mr. Scott, I guess I'll go to you next. It appears, based on Mr. Canoni's recommendations, that this proposed amendment does not affect your clients.

MR. SCOTT: That seems to be, your Honor. If this isn't going to be an amendment as to DFS or Governor Cuomo, I don't have much to add beyond what we've already submitted to the Court.

The only thing I would note is, I assume if there are going to be further discovery demands after the complaint, that some portion that is going to be directed to DFS, given that -- I'm assuming that the activities allegedly occurred during Ms. Vullo's tenure at DFS. So to the extent that those new demands somehow impact to the currently pending motions, again, without seeing the complaint, without seeing the demands, it's tough to say how that's going to impact things but that would be my only point of concern on that issue.

THE COURT: All right. Ms. Greenberger, good afternoon.

MS. GREENBERGER: Good afternoon, your Honor.

It's interesting to me to hear yet a third basis for -
for an amendment, given that Your Honor had a conference

with us, asked for written documents, and in those

written documents -- and I'm referring to the November

-NATIONAL RIFLE v CUOMO - 18-cv-566-

25th submission -- Mr. Canoni spoke to two potential sources of a basis to plead claims against Ms. Vullo. One was documents he got from Lloyd's in June and the other is recent information concerning supposedly DFS activity against AGIA and then when we said neither of those are a basis to replead at this late stage, now I'm hearing for the very first time that supposedly there was some consulting individual that Mr. Canoni learned about within the last month, which is very confusing why that would not be in the submission that Your Honor specifically directed to answer this question.

THE COURT: Let me know if you can answer,
Mr. Canoni, that question. Mr. Canoni, why is there no
reference to this consultant in your letter of
November 25th of 2019?

MR. CANONI: Well, your Honor, out of courtesy, we needed to reach out to that person and we're not able to reach that person in between the time of the morning teleconference and the time the letter was submitted.

We did say in the letter to Your Honor that we sought the deposition of a representative of Lloyd's America to interpret the Lloyd's documents.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. CANONI: We couldn't just amend on the

1 basis of the documents themselves.

THE COURT: Okay?

3 MR. CANONI: So that is the explanation for

4 that.

2

6

7

8

16

18

19

20

21

22

25

5 THE COURT: Go ahead, Ms. Greenberger.

MS. GREENBERGER: While I recognize that

Mr. Canoni would prefer not to reveal this person's

information, I actually think where we are now, which is

9 that there has been months and months of delay, it's his

10 burden to show that he acted with reasonable diligence,

11 and I don't think he can meet that burden unless he

12 demonstrates who this supposed source is and when he

13 | first had communications with this source so that we

14 have a basis to analyze whether he acted with diligence

15 when he learned this information.

THE COURT: What else, if anything, do you

17 want to tell me, Ms. Greenberger?

THE COURT:

MS. GREENBERGER: I just want to add one last thing, which is this idea that it's not the same discovery. Your Honor has already ruled on this. In your August decision you said certain discovery is not relevant because there's no selective enforcement claim

and so if they are permitted to replead these claims, we

24 are then going to be back at least six months behind.

That's part of my concern. Do you

1 have some suggestion, Ms. Greenberger, other than 2 denying his application to move this matter forward in a 3 more expeditious and orderly fashion? MS. GREENBERGER: I think that there should 4 5 be -- you know, I think we should have been here today 6 with him giving the real allegations so we can have a 7 productive conversation as to whether there's something I mean, just as a reminder, it's not just that he 8 9 needs to plead knowledge of the violations. He needs to 10 be able to plead, and I'm quoting from Judge McAvoy's --11 THE COURT: May 9th decision. 12 MS. GREENBERGER: May 10th decision that 13 Ms. Vullo consciously declined to enforce the insurance laws against the comparators. He needs to have 14 15 plausible, specific allegations. I haven't heard 16 anything today about that at all. THE COURT: Mr. Canoni, would you like the 17 18 last word? 19 MR. CANONI: Your Honor, I just --20 THE COURT: Mr. Canoni, I really just asked to 21 be polite. 22 MR. CANONI: Sorry? 23 I'm just asking but go ahead. THE COURT: 24 MR. CANONI: Unless Your Honor needs anything 25 further, I think it's set forth in what we have

-NATIONAL RIFLE v CUOMO - 18-cv-566-1 discussed already in our letters. 2 THE COURT: That was very good, Mr. Canoni. 3 Thank you. I'm pretty smart for a dumb guy. MR. CANONI: 4 5 THE COURT: You came all the way from Dallas, 6 I'm going to grant your application to make Mr. Canoni. 7 the motion seeking leave to serve an amended complaint. What is your briefing schedule, Mr. Canoni, 8 9 that you propose? 10 MR. CANONI: I had proposed December 13th for 11 the moving papers, January 10th for opposition, and 12 January 21st for reply. 13 THE COURT: Let me ask you as a practical matter. Does that give your firm enough time to prepare 14 15 your motion? I assume Ms. Sisco is going to do it. 16 Unless the practice of law has changed since I was an 17 associate, I assume she's going to do it, not you. 18 that sufficient time? Would you like an additional 19 week? 20 MR. CANONI: We believe so but I will always 21 take Your Honor's suggestion for these things. 22 THE COURT: So if I give you an additional 23 week, what is the date you are looking at? That would be 12/20 and 24 MR. CANONI:

Lisa L. Tennyson, CSR, RMR, FCRR UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT - NDNY

January 17th, and then we don't need an extra day for

25

the federal holiday on the Monday. So that would be 1/27.

THE COURT: Ms. Greenberger, does that give you sufficient time to respond, given the holidays?

MS. GREENBERGER: I expect so. Obviously I -once I get back to my office, if there's any concern
with my client or with my colleagues, I will let you
know but I expect that should be fine.

THE COURT: I will entertain any reasonable requests for an extension.

MR. CANONI: Your Honor, I don't think you need to but if there's a reasonable extension, we will stipulate to it.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. CANONI: I know Your Honor has been asking us to get along.

17 THE COURT: Mr. Scott?

MR. SCOTT: Again, I don't have the papers in front of me. Assuming Mr. Canoni's represented, we -- it should be fine.

THE COURT: Okay. So let me just tell you what I'm going to do from my perspective. I'm going to take a much more hands-on approach. Again, I'm very concerned with the fact this case appears to me to be going nowhere. So my law clerk and I are going to take

some of these motions out of order.

Traditionally, we decide motion in the order on which they're filed. So we are going to make a plan and take some of these motions out of order. The first motion that we're going to address is, Ms. Greenberger, is your motion to re-argue with respect to Ms. Vullo. We may or may not want to conduct oral argument on that motion.

It was my intention to have that conversation with my career law clerk today but, unfortunately, she's home with a migraine and so I could not discuss it with her. So once I do that, I will let you know whether or not we are going to do oral argument but I anticipate that will be the next motion that we address.

Once that is done, we will probably do another couple motions and we will take another one of these motions until we work our way through them. I don't know what Judge McAvoy's schedule is with respect to the things that's on appeal; that's up to Judge McAvoy to determine.

So, other than telling you to have a nice holiday, Mr. Canoni and Mr. Scott, anything we can do for you this morning?

MR. CANONI: Your Honor, just to resurrect the idea of trying to expedite and perhaps try appeals from

-NATIONAL RIFLE v CUOMO - 18-cv-566-1 the special master --2 THE COURT: Why don't you send me a letter 3 setting forth your position, and Mr. Scott and 4 Ms. Greenberger, you can file responses and then once I 5 get your responses, I will sit down with Mr. Hill and 6 review that idea with him and get some sense if he 7 thinks it's helpful or not helpful to him. I will also 8 get some sense of where of where he is and once I do 9 that, at our next conference I will give you some 10 indication where he stands with respect to reviewing 11 these document. 12 I spoke to him last a couple of weeks ago and 13 he asked me to give him a couple weeks to get started. 14 So I haven't spoken to him. 15 You folks are all set. Have a nice holiday. 16 MR. CANONI: Thank you. 17 MS. GREENBERGER: Thank you. 18 (Proceeding concluded) 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 Lisa L. Tennyson, CSR, RMR, FCRR UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT - NDNY

CERTIFICATION

I, Lisa L. Tennyson, RMR, CSR, CRR, Federal
Official Realtime Court Reporter, in and for the United
States District Court for the Northern District of New
York, do hereby certify that pursuant to Section 753,
Title 28, United States Code, that the foregoing is a
true and correct transcript of the stenographically
reported proceedings held in the above-entitled matter
and that the transcript page format is in conformance
with the regulations of the Judicial Conference of the
United States.

____ fire L. Gerryson _

Lisa L. Tennyson, R.M.R., C.S.R., C.R.R.